Date: Wed, 19 May 93 04:30:39 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #154
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 19 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 154

Today's Topics:
uk.radio.amateur newsgroup?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

Date: 19 May 93 09:21:55 GMT
From: pipex!uknet!edcastle!spider!raft.spider.co.uk!jmorris@uunet.uu.net
Subject: uk.radio.amateur newsgroup?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <97LN4B2w164w@ham.almanac.bc.ca> emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca writes:
>dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:
>
>> I have posted this to a few uk-only groups but as some affected people don't
>> get those groups but might be on here, I will put it here as well:
>>
>> Is anyone interested in a uk.radio.amateur newsgroup? The rec groups are
>> mainly biased towards North America, although frequented by amateurs from
>> the rest of the world as well. The new group would be for UK-based issues,
>> as well as providing a good place for non-UK amateurs to ask any questions
>> they might have about our system.
>>
>> As an aside, it is worth noting that there are some aus.radio groups, and
>> a few for other countries as well so the idea isn't new :-)
>>
>> Dave
>>

>
>
>Actually, Dave, I'd vastly prefer to see more non - North Americans on
>all the rec-radio newsgroups. It sure won't happen, though if you split
>off the UK amateurs.
>
>73, Bob.
>
I must disagree, Bob. I think there is a place for postings of purely national interest. Currently much of the traffic in r.r.a.misc and r.r.a.policy is very USA oriented: Perhaps you can imagine just how little interest (or even meaning!) lengthy discussions of the finer points of the FCC regulations have for non-US amateurs. Half the time, I don't even understand the question, never mind the comments!

Sure, the international groups are very important - we are all involved in one of the few (only?) truly international hobbies, after all. But there are subjects which would be better kept within countries, the same as there are topics which are best kept within their own newsgroups. For example, the "code wars" need to be kept in "policy", and out of "misc", and by the same token, there are things which a UK-oriented group would be expected to carry which would not be of interest outside the UK, and would only waste bandwidth. For example, I am sure a uk.radio.amateur group would have its periodic pro/anti RSGB flame wars, our own version of the code/no-code debate (all class B's are lazy and incompetent, all class A's are complacent old farts...), notifications of club meets, special event stations, WAB activiations, progress with NOVs, repeater updates...

I enjoy r.r.a.misc et al, but there are a lot of items in there which have no applicability to the UK: How to fit a rig (which is not available here) into a car (which is also not available here). (No - don't stop - this is not meant to be an anti-such-messages flame, just an example). If amateurs from all countries posted such stuff then it would start to get hard to find the stuff really relevant to oneself.

I would actually like to see r.r.a.uk, r.r.a.france, r.r.a.japan, r.r.a.usa, and so on, so that those outside a country but interested in the internal goings-on could still follow them - but the long procedures needed to agree and then set up such a long list are beyond my time resources (and possibly beyond my competence, before anyone else says it :-)

I think Dave's idea is therefore a good one, as "uk" groups can be created with less red tape. If other countries wished to set up similar groups - well, good luck. It it certainly the case now that a _lot_ of uk amateurs are reading and posting to several of the "uk" groups, and and least one (me :-) thinks it would be a good idea to have somewhere to discuss purely national things. We (well, I) would not be deserting the international groups, just aiming posts at the appropriate audience, thus hopefully

improving the S/N ratio for us all. (I know that in theory "distribution" could be used to the same effect - but with current software that does not appear to work very well.)

73, John

--
John Morris != Spider Systems   jmorris@spider.co.uk   GM4ANB@GB7EDN.#77.GBR.EU

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 06:10:12 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May11.182530.22198@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May13.081003.20215@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May14.233610.329@leland.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May14.233610.329@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>In article <1993May13.081003.20215@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:
>>CW ops don't fill in bit errors either, or am I wrong that good CW ops don't
>>hear the bits but instead hear whole letter sounds?
>
>Yes, but if you get a garble, you 1) at least know what the garble "sounded
>like", and given context, that's usually enough information to correct
>the garble. Unless you're running a tree code on top of RTTY, you have no
>equivalent to the "sounded like" information; in fact, you throw it away.

What it "sounds like" is a static crash, a hetrodyne, or a fade into the mud. On HF, the "garble" rarely lasts for less than a character time. You have to depend on context on CW just like you do with RTTY to recover the missing letter, or letters. Bit information doesn't help because multiple bit strings are trashed. If you look at the error statistics for an HF channel, the bit errors are not randomly distributed. Instead they occur in runs of several bits. So in either case you "throw away" the garbled character, or characters.

>>Having less spectrum isn't really apples and apples here. Because the
>>HF spectrum spans octaves, it's wider in a sense than a UHF band.
>
>Um, no. First of all, only a portion of HF is open to a particular path
>at any one time. Secondly , the amateur allocations are quite narrow; if
>you go outside those allocations with any appreciable number of users, you
>will raise the noise floor for everybody else.

If you'd bothered to read beyond the first sentence you quote, you'd know that I was talking about interrupted spreading sequences that don't put energy outside the amateur bands. As to differing propagation, that's one of the advantages of HF. It practically guarrantees that *some* of the energy, on some band, will always reach the destination. That gives you a channel available nearly around the clock between any two arbitrary points on the globe. This is very different from UHF SS where propagation is nearly constant. By taking advantage of this very broad, in octaves, frequency diversity, channel availability is enhanced.

>>As to it not being cheap, when I started out in electronics a solid
>>state adding machine cost $4000.
>
>Yes, but DSP hasn't seen much of a cost reduction (at least compared to
>general processing) since its introduction. The reason is that somebody has
>to write the software. Aside from there not being too many somebodys that
>can do this, it's not a trivial hack.   So I doubt you're going to see
>dramatic reductions in end user cost any time soon.

We already have, DSP systems are available for as little as $199 today, and prices continue to drop. DSP offers many advantages, but it's not necessary in order to utilize SS. That only requires high speed multipliers, or rapidly switchable synthesizers, such as DDS, in order to use PN spreading or hopping. Hopping is easier for HF, though suitable PN codes can be designed with the required forbidden zones as well. Getting the *people* to do it *is* a problem, and is the problem being addressed by the proposed licensing changes. By attracting more people who are not brain washed by narrow thinking, it's possible we will get the programming done. People imprinted with the idea that narrow is better won't tackle the job.

Gary
--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 08:03:58 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!
ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <93133.135221WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>,
<1993May14.134347.26989@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May17.091727.1@ttd.teradyne.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?

In article <1993May17.091727.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:
>In article <1993May14.134347.26989@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman)
writes:
>> Certainly you can pass now if you miss all the ATV questions, and ATV
>> is just as valid an operating mode as Morse. It's becoming nearly as
>   ----------------------
>> popular too.
> ------------
>>
>
>Uhh - I wouldn't go that far.
>
>ATV may be getting more popular, but 'nearly as popular' as CW? Naaaahhhhh.
>There's not enough bandwidth in the 'world' to support a tiny fraction of
>the ATV signals as compared to the CW signals on 20meters on any given day.

Ever hear of frequency reuse? If my informal survey of 20 meter CW usage
is anywhere near representative, 15 of 80 signals on the band, then I
see more ATV stations on the air in Atlanta alone than that. One of the
advantages of UHF is the ability to confine the signal path such that
others may reuse the spectrum on relatively short geographical spacings.
The potential information content of a visual representation also means
that more temporal sharing can occur. A diagram that takes minutes to
explain on voice, or hours on CW, can be shown in seconds on ATV. Thus
transmissions need not be as long and boring.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 07:55:11 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!
ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May17.174007.20126@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <C76uF0.70@ucdavis.edu>,
<1993May18.161633.28800@leland.Stanford.EDU>0
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May18.161633.28800@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu

(Paul Flaherty) writes:
>In article <C76uF0.70@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:
>
>>Please explain this. I've heard this same point before but it never did
>>make any sense to me. I personally have a certain amount of information
>>I want to transfer. If I want to talk aboutthe fact that my girlfriends
>>softball team just earned a berth in the Div II National Tournament then
>>I'm gonna do it whether I'm on ssb, fm, packet, cw or the internet :-)
>
>Most hams have a limited amount of time to spend on the air (a few hours
>between chores, etc.). If that time is shorter, the amount of subjects
>discussed will be reduced. As the time to operate is lengthened, either
>more subjects are discussed, or more QSOs are had. This is true whether one
>is keeping a sked, chewing the rag, chasing DX, contesting, etc. Remember,
>our conversations, by their nature, are supposed to be casual.

Most hams do have a finite amount of time to spend on the air. Therefore
the mode that conveys the most information in the least time is the most
useful to them. That should be self apparent. It seems you are saying that
hams have a limited amount of information to convey, and that they want to
pick a mode that's *slow* enough to fill up all their time in conveying it.
That's hardly efficient use of spectrum, or time.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 07:44:59 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!
ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May14.232317.29816@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993May17.141704.9374@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May17.174451.20242@leland.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May17.174451.20242@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:
>In article <1993May17.141704.9374@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:
>

>>That crowding could lead to innovative new techniques for sharing HF
>>spectrum, or it could degenerate into on air flame wars. I prefer to
>>view the former as worth any of the latter that may occur.
>
>Problem is, the service has to be justified to the ITU every few years, and
>a few more of those flame wars could do the service in. Nothing is stopping
>you from developing those techniques right now, especially with an
>Experimental Service license.

The service doesn't have to be justified to the ITU at all. As long as
a majority of the political representatives of the signatory nations find
it expedient for amateur radio to remain, it will. Whenever it's political
clout drops below that of another party demanding spectrum, it loses. Merit,
or lack of same, of operators or their testing procedures, has little to do
with it. An example is CB. That service, started by the US at the expense of
amateur spectrum, has now spread to other nations. It's continued existance
is certainly not a result of the exemplary behavior of some of it's operators.

As for experimental licenses, I held one. It's a useful license for some
things, but for techniques that require widespread testing, it's less
than ideal. The amateur license is *also* an experimental license, and
offers a much wider testing ground.

Gary
--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #154
****